UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2509

H. LEIGHTON LASKEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF BALTIMORE; MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL FOR THE CITY OF BALTIMORE; LAW DEPT. FOR THE CITY OF BALTIMORE; CHRISTOPHER R. LUNDY, Defense Counsel City of Baltimore; PAUL GRAZIANO, Commissioner Baltimore City Housing; THE STATE OF MARYLAND; THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COURT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, Chief District Judge. (1:15-cv-02995-CCB)

Submitted: February 23, 2016 Decided: February 25, 2016

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

H. Leighton Laskey, Appellant Pro Se. William Rowe Phelan, Jr., BALTIMORE CITY LAW DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

H. Leighton Laskey seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his civil action without prejudice. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (2012), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (2012); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541, 545-46 (1949). Because Laskey may be able to remedy the pleading deficiencies identified by the district court by filing an amended complaint, we conclude the order Laskey seeks to appeal is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order. Goode v. Cent. Va. Legal Aid Soc'y, Inc., 807 F.3d 619, 623-24 (4th Cir. 2015); Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED